

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Susan Hoy,

Plaintiff

v.

Andrea Hernandez, et al.,

Defendants

Case No. 2:20-cv-00103-CDS-MDC

Order Rejecting Proposed
Joint Pretrial Order

[ECF No. 168]

The parties submitted a proposed joint pretrial order on February 2, 2023. ECF No. 168. Because the parties' proposed joint pretrial order does not comply with Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4, I hereby reject it.

The pretrial order violates Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4 for a number of reasons. Regarding the schedules of exhibits, the parties represent that because of "the recent settlement of Plaintiff's claims against Lisa Brochu and Clark County" they anticipate "significantly" "pair[ing] down" the proposed list of joint exhibits. ECF No. 168 at 4 n.2. The purpose of the joint pretrial order is to streamline trial preparation and the presentation of evidence. Local Rule 16-3(b)(8) requires parties to list "the exhibits that will be offered in evidence by the parties at the trial." The extensive list provided does not comply satisfy this rule, especially since the parties concede it will be significantly pared down. The proposed order also states that the parties "reserve the right to object to the admission of the exhibits []." ECF No. 168 at 4 n.1. There is no such right. All objections to exhibits must be included in the proposed order. Furthermore, the parties include a blanket list of the following objections to each other's exhibits: "relevance, hearsay, speculation, foundation, and authenticity and prejudicial effect" (*id.* at 25) violates Local Rule 16-3(b)(8)(B). Objections must relate to each exhibit, and not merely be generic objections to all exhibits.

12 Conclusion

16 Dated: February 27, 2024

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26